DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 624 FL 021 200

AUTHOR Lee, Eileen Yen Ee; Boutin, Michael E.
TITLE Pronominal Differences in Languages of Sabah and Sarawak and the Effect on the Acquisition of Bahasa Malaysia.
PUB DATE [92]
NOTE 15p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Contrastive Linguistics; Descriptive Linguistics; Foreign Countries; Indonesian Languages; *Malay; *Pronouns; *Second Language Learning; Status
IDENTIFIERS Bonggi; Kelabit; *Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Bilingual education programs must be based on a sound understanding of the linguistic, social, psychological, and cultural factors affecting students. This paper is concerned with linguistic factors that affect the acquisition of Bahasa Malaysia (BM) pronouns by non-native speakers from Sabah and Sarawak. Properties in the personal pronoun systems of three Malaysian languages are compared in order to understand problems in the acquisition of BM by first-language speakers of Bongii from Sabah and Kelabit from Sarawak. Specifically, the problem of property mismatch in language differences in language acquisition is addressed through study of grammatical properties found in the three pronominal systems. These properties are categorized as case, person, noun, status, or definiteness. Singular/plural properties are found in BM, singular/plural/dual are found in Bongii, and singular/plural/dual/trial in Kelabit. It is suggested that acquisition of the property status is a formidable task for Bongii and Kalabit speakers to aspire to use BM pronouns appropriately. Contains 35 references. (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED357624

PRONOMINAL DIFFERENCES IN LANGUAGES OF SABAH AND SARAWAK AND THE EFFECT ON THE ACQUISITION OF BAHASA MALAYSIA

Eileen Yen Ee Lee
Universiti Pertanian Malaysia Kampus Bintulu
&
Michael E. Boutin
Institut Linguistik SIL Malaysia

1. INTRODUCTION

Bilingual education programs need to be based on a sound understanding of the linguistic, social, psychological, and cultural factors affecting the students (Saville & Troike 1971:5). This paper is concerned with linguistic factors which affect the acquisition of Bahasa Malaysia (BM) pronouns by non-native speakers from Sabah and Sarawak.

Specifically, this paper compares properties in the personal pronoun systems of three Malaysian languages with a view to understanding problems in the acquistion of BM by first language (L1) speakers of Bonggi from Sabah and Kelabit from Sarawak.

We address the problem of property mismatch in language acquisition by looking at differences in the pronoun systems of Bahasa Malaysia, Bonggi, and Kelabit. This paper is comparative in two ways: (1) it compares properties within the pronominal system of each language, and (2) it compares properties across the three languages.

In section 2 we examine the grammatical properties found in the three pronominal systems, while section 3 summarizes the differences in these properties.

2. GRAMMATICAL PROPERTIES IN PRONOMINAL SYSTEMS

All languages have a class of words which is commonly referred to as personal pronouns. The primary function of pronouns is to refer to an entity.[1] Thus, personal pronouns (*I*, *you*, etc.) have a deictic function whose meaning is determined with reference to the situation of utterance (Lyons 1968:275). Prototypical utterances are egocentric with the role of the speaker changing throughout a conversation. Thus, "The centre of the 'deictic' system switches (*I* being used by each speaker to refer to himself, *you* being used to refer to the hearer)" (op. loc.).

---

[1] Hopper & Thompson (1984) take the position that linguistic forms including pronouns are acategorical outside of discourse (1984:747). According to this view, pronominalization is a discourse strategy which is used when reduced saliency is desired. In any case, the reduced saliency of pronouns in contrast to nouns is a secondary function of pronominalization.

FL021257

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lee; Boutin
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Pronouns, like nouns, are a subclass of noun phrase (NP). Free pronouns normally have all the distributional characteristics of NPs.[2] Thus, pronouns and nouns tend to share grammatical properties within languages.[3]

The grammatical properties or features associated with the lexical category pronoun vary within restricted limits from language to language. Because the lexical category pronoun has different properties or features in different languages, this may pose different problems for both the language user and language learner.

Although the class noun tends to be a nonfinite set of words in language, pronouns typically occur in a paradigmatic set of a limited number of words (Sugamoto 1989:268). Bonggi and Kelabit pronouns are limited to one pronoun per position in the paradigmatic set. For example, in Bonggi given the three grammatical properties: person, number, and case, first-person singular nominative-case pronoun is restricted to ou. However, given these same three properties in BM, pronouns are not limited to one per position in the paradigmatic set, e.g., first-person singular nominative-case pronoun can be *saya, aku, patek,* or *beta*. The difference in the choice of BM pronouns is sociolinguistically conditioned and cannot be accounted for solely in terms of the three properties: person, number, and case (cf. sec. 2.4).

In the remainder of this section, we examine the grammatical properties which are found in the three pronominal systems, i.e., case (sec. 2.1), person (sec. 2.2), number (sec. 2.3), status (sec. 2.4), and definiteness (sec. 2.5). Two of these properties, i.e., person and number, are universal features of pronouns. Greenberg (1963:96) states, "All languages have pronominal categories involving at least three persons and two numbers."

2.1 Case

Besides the universal distinctions between person and number, some languages divide pronouns into sets on the basis of case. For instance, nominative-case pronouns are used for subject (e.g., *I, he*), accusative-case pronouns are used for object (e.g., *me, him*), and genitive-case pronouns are used for the possessor in noun phrases (e.g., *my, his*).

Case marking is based on the syntactic function of the NP. It is imposed by the structural configuration within which that NP occurs. For example, in English, verbs are said to 'govern' the case of their subjects which occur in the nominative case.

Each different case indicates a different syntactic function of the NP and has a corresponding set of pronouns. For example, in Bonggi there are three

---

[2]Free pronouns contrast with clitic or bound pronouns which usually have a more restricted distribution.

[3]We use the term 'grammatical properties' to refer to what are sometimes called 'grammatical categories.' For example, the property number is equivalent to the grammatical category number. Carstairs (1987) uses the term 'morphosyntactic categories' to refer to number, case, tense, etc., and the term 'morphosyntactic properties' to refer to Singular, Plural, Nominative, etc.

sets of pronouns which are described in terms of the case distinctions nominative, accusative, and genitive as shown by the singular pronouns in Table 1:[4]

Table 1
Bonggi case distinctions

	Nominative	Accusative	Genitive
1sg	ou	diaadn	ku
2sg	aha	diha	nu
3sg	sia	ngia	ngia

The properties person and number are constant throughout the paradigm in Table 1, and are unaffected by case differences. Thus, only nominative-case pronouns are compared in this paper.

2.2 Person

The property person is defined with reference to the notion of participant role. The first person is used to refer to the speaker, the second person to the addressee, and the third person to participants other than the speaker or addressee.

Person is a referential property and thus is discourse dependent. Pronouns lexicalize the property person and have suppletive forms, e.g., *I*, *you*, *he*.

Besides the universal three-way distinction in person, all three languages under investigation in this paper make a distinction in the first-person plural between inclusive and exclusive pronouns. Inclusive and exclusive first-person pronouns are distinguished on the basis of whether the pronoun includes the addressee or not. For example, in BM *kita* 'we (incl)' includes both speaker and addressee, while *kami* 'we (excl)' includes only the speaker.

2.3 Number

The property number is usually associated with nouns and personal pronouns. Although number is an obligatory property of pronominal NPs in all languages,[5] it is an optional property of nominal NPs in some languages. For example, in Bonggi new participants in a narrative are often introduced by an existential verb and the nominal participant is unspecified for number.[6] In (1) lama is

[4] We use these abbreviations: DEF = definite; dl = dual; excl = exclusive; incl = inclusive; pl = plural; REC = reciprocal; sg = singular; tl = trial.

[5] The English second-person pronoun you is not an exception. The contrast between singular and plural is simply neutralized.

[6] Cf. English where the singular/plural distinction is obligatorily marked for all countable nouns. In some cases the contrast is morphologically marked, e.g. dog vs. dogs; in other cases the contrast is lexically marked, e.g. person vs. people; and in other cases the contrast is neutralized, e.g. sheep.

interpreted as either singular or plural depending on the anaphoric pronominal reference which follows as in (2) or (3):[7]

(1) Kiara lama miatakng tidii Kudat.
existential person came from Kudat
'There was someone who came from Kudat.' / 'There were some people who came from Kudat.'

(2) Sia metak dii bali ku.
he stay at house my
'He is staying at my house.'

(3) Sigelama na metak dii bali ku.
they DEF stay at house my
'They are staying at my house.'

Seventy years ago Sapir pointed out various ways in which the concept of number is elaborated in language. These include: 1) singular and plural; 2) singular, dual, and plural; 3) singular, dual, trial, and plural; and 4) single, distributive, and collective (Sapir 1921:108).[8]

The three languages discussed in this paper appear to exemplify three of the four ways in which number is elaborated in language. Bahasa Malaysia has a simple distinction in number between singular and plural (sec. 2.3.1). Bonggi appears to make a further distinction in number by including a dual pronoun (cf. sec. 2.3.2), while Kelabit has a four-way number distinction which includes: singular, plural, dual, and trial (sec. 2.3.3).

The most common distinction in the property number is that between singular and plural. In some languages singular nouns are morphologically unmarked while plural nouns are morphologically marked. Other languages, like Bonggi, do not mark plural grammatically. In languages with a dual or trial, the dual and the trial are almost always morphologically marked (Greenberg 1963:94). In BM singular nouns are unmarked and reduplication is used to mark plural nouns.

Unlike nominals, pronouns tend to lexicalize the property number and have suppletive forms, e.g., *I, we*.

2.3.1 *Bahasa Malaysia (Singular/Plural)*

Excluding the sociolinguistic aspects of BM (cf. sec. 2.4), there are six nominative-case pronouns which can be distinguished along three semantic parameters: person (first, second, third), number (singular, plural), and exclusive versus inclusive. The resulting structural analysis is shown in Table 2 (cf. Asmah 1983:92):

---

[7]Although lama in (1) can be interpreted as either singular or plural, the unmarked form is the singular. Evidence for the singular being unmarked comes from imperatives, where the addressee is interpreted as singular whenever the pronoun is unspecified, e.g., Pitiaa' na! 'Kill (it)!' Plural addressees must be overtly marked, e.g., Pitiaa' nyu na! 'You (pl) kill (it)!'

[8]Cf. Love (1974) for a methodology for formalizing distinctions in number between pronouns.

Table 2
Bahasa Malaysia Nominative-case Pronouns

	Singular	Plural
1 excl	saya	kami
incl		kita
2	awak[9]	
3	dia	mereka

2.3.2 Bonggi (Singular/Plural/Dual)

Bonggi has eight contrastive nominative-case pronouns. A traditional analysis of these eight pronouns distinguishes three semantic parameters: person (first, second, third), number (singular, dual, plural), and exclusive versus inclusive. The resulting structural analysis is shown in Table 3:[10]

Table 3
Traditional Analysis of Bonggi Nominative-case Pronouns

	Singular	Dual	Plural
1 excl	ou		ihi
incl		kita	kiti
2	aha		uhu
3	sia		sigelama

Pronominal systems with an eight-way contrast like Bonggi are best described as having three semantic oppositions (speaker, addressee, and plural) which are illustrated in Table 4:[11]

Table 4
Our Analysis of Bonggi Nominative-case Pronouns

	-Plural	+Plural
+Speaker -Addressee	ou	ihi
+Speaker +Addressee	kita	kiti
-Speaker +Addressee	aha	uhu
-Speaker -Addressee	sia	sigelama

[9]Asmah (1983:92) says, "The second person category has the plural indicated in phrasal form." Thus, according to her, second-person plural is awak semua (cf. Table 6 in sec. 2.4 and the discussion of second-person pronouns which follows).

[10]Cf. Conklin (1962:134) for a possible analysis of Hanunóo pronouns along these same lines. Hanunóo, like Bonggi, has eight contrastive nominative-case pronouns.

[11]Cf. Thomas (1955) for Ilocano; McKaughan (1959) for Maranao; Conklin (1962) for Hanunóo; and Elkins (1973) for Western Bukidnon Manobo. All three of these papers state that the traditional properties of person and number are inadequate for describing the pronominal systems in question. For a similar conclusion with respect to two Australian languages see McKay (1978).

The "dual" (kita) in Bonggi is [-plural] since both speaker and addressee are single individuals (cf. McKaughan 1959:101 for Maranao; cf. also Elkins 1973:113 for Western Bukidnon Manobo). As Thomas (1955:205) points out for Ilocano, kita (dual) "is restricted to cooperative action by one speaker and one hearer; no one else may be included under this pronoun."

According to the analysis proposed in Table 4, Bonggi personal pronouns distinguish TWO grammatical numbers: singular and plural. In the remainder of this section we present evidence that the dual is not grammaticalized in the pronominal system in Bonggi, nor is it substantiated in the rest of the language (cf. Thomas 1955:205 for Ilocano).[11]

The dual is used to refer to two people or two objects. In languages that have a dual, three classes of elements may receive dual marking: 1) personal pronouns; 2) nouns; and 3) words showing non-pronominal agreement (Plank 1989:299). The presence of either a nominal dual or non-pronominal agreement with a dual implies a pronominal dual (op. cit. 297ff.).

There is no special dual which occurs with nominal arguments in Bonggi. Nouns are not marked for grammatical number. Lexical number is used in order to be specific, in which case the number preceeds either the noun it modifies, e.g. dua lama 'two people', or the classifier it modifies, e.g. (4) (cf. (1)):

(4) Kiara lama miataknng tidii Kudat, dua tuni.
existential person came from Kudat two body
'There were two people who came from Kudat.'

Like nominal dual, non-pronominal agreement with a dual does not occur in Bonggi. Plank (1989:300) states that in Chamorro, "Duality is expressed by means of singular verbs accompanying plural nominal or pronominal subjects (cf. Topping 1973). A similar situation occurs with reciprocals in Bonggi as shown in (5):

(5) Sigelama na ig-bunu'.
they DEF REC-fight
'They are fighting (with each other).'

The subject in (5) is plural. Reciprocal verbs can also occur with singular subjects in which case the other nominal argument is marked by ma' 'with', indicating it is an oblique argument, e.g. (6):

(6) Sia ig-bunu' ma' saa ngia.
he REC-fight with spouse his
'He is fighting with his wife.'

Although reciprocal verbs require two semantic arguments, the exact number of participants in the action is not restricted to two people. For example, the subject sigelama na in (5) can refer to any number of participants greater than one.

---

[11] Cf. Alutor which is a language containing both a dual in the pronominal system and a dualizer in the verb morphology (Mel'čuk 1986).

Plank (1989:301) also discusses 'cooperative' verbal duals which express an action carried out by the subject in cooperation with one other person. A similar situation occurs in Bonggi with some verbs which are marked by ki- as shown in (7):

(7) **Sia ki-tuud diaadn kerai.**
he ASK-help me work
'He asked me to help him work.'

Although both arguments in (7) are singular, they could also be plural. The function of the verbal prefixes ig- and ki- is to characterize events and not to enumerate participants (cf. Mithun 1989).[13]

None of the three classes of elements which are typically associated with dual marking (i.e., personal pronouns, nouns, and agreement words) receive dual marking in Bonggi except the "pseudo-dual" kita which is analyzed as [-plural].

All of the languages of Sabah which are reported to have a dual restrict the dual to the first-person inclusive pronoun. These languages include: Coastal Kadazan, Labuk-Kinabatangan Kadazan, Kimaragang, Rungus, Lotud, Tatana', Timugon, Gana, Tagal, Tombonuwo, Makiang, and Bonggi (Boutin 1991:5). The dual which occurs in these languages is a pseudo-dual in contrast to that found in Kelabit (cf. sec. 2.3.3; cf. also Greenberg 1988).

Other languages which are reported to have a dual include: Classical Greek (Diver 1987) and Sanskrit (Diver 1987:103);[14] some Australian languages, e.g., Djeebbana (McKay 1978), Garawa (Furby 1972), and Rembarrnga (McKay 1978); some Papuan languages, e.g., Fore (Pike 1963), and Kunimaipa (Pence 1968); some Aslian languages of Peninsular Malaysia, e.g., Semai, Temiar, and Che' Wong;[15] some Philippine languages, e.g., Agusan Manobo (Weaver & Weaver 1964), Atta (Lusted, Whittle & Reid 1964), Hanuñoo (Conklin 1962), Ilocano (Thomas 1955), Maranao (McKaughan 1959), and Western Bukidnon Manobo (Elkins 1973); and some Oceanic languages, e.g., Larike (Laidig & Laidig 1990).

2.3.3 Kelabit (Singular/Plural/Dual/Trial)

Kelabit is a language spoken by approximately 5,000 people in the Fourth and Fifth Divisions of Sarawak, Malaysia. Kelabit is part of the Apo Duat dialect complex (Hudson 1978:24). According to Blust (n.d.) Apo Duat dialects fall into

---

[13]Mithun (1988) and (1989) present evidence from North American languages that 'number' is not necessarily a nominal property.

[14]In Sanskrit the properties dual and plural are mutually exclusive, i.e., the dual must be used whenever two objects are referred to (Diver 1987:103). On the other hand, when two objects were referred to in Classical Greek, the speaker had a choice between the dual (more precise) and the plural (less precise) (Diver 1987:103). Diver (1987:103) claims that the dual in Classical Greek is a highlighting device.

[15]Diffloth (1979:8) uses the presence of a dual in Semai, Temiar, and Che' Wong as an argument for their being part of the Mon-Khmer language family since many Mon-Khmer languages have a dual including Bahner, Katu (Wallace 1965), Khmu, Pacoh (Watson 1976:84), and Palaung.

three clusters: 1) Lun Dayeh/Lun Bawang, 2) Kelabit, and 3) Sa'ban (cf. Hudson 1978:24f).

In addition to differentiating pronouns along the lines of exclusive versus inclusive, Kelabit distinguishes number with a full set of duals and trials. Trials are used to refer to three people. Languages with a trial also have a singular, plural, and dual (Lyons 1968:283).[16] Besides Kelabit, trial pronouns are found in other Sarawakian languages, e.g., Uma Juman Kayan (Blust 1977:40);[17] and some Austronesian languages, e.g., Larike (Laidig & Laidig 1990).[18] Fijian has a paucal which has been referred to as a trial by some people (Schutz 1985:251; cf. Lyons 1968:283).[19]

Kelabit has fifteen constrastive nominative-case pronouns which are shown in Table 5:

Table 5
Kelabit Nominative-case Pronouns

	Singular	Dual	Trial	Plural
1 excl	uwih	kadiwah	kataluh	kamih
incl		kitah	taluh	tau
2	iko	maduah	mataluh	muyuh
3	iyah	diwah	dataluh	idah

Table 5 indicates that first-person singular inclusive is a paradigmatic gap. However, kitah, like Bonggi kita (cf. sec. 2.3.2), is restricted to one speaker and one addressee. Thus, perhaps the paradigmatic gap is actually the first-person dual inclusive and not the singular.

Two arguments support the gap being the dual and not the singular. The dual and trial forms probably result from using the numbers duah 'two' and taluh 'three' in combination with the plural pronouns.[20] However, among the dual and trial forms in Table 5, only kitah lacks a historical reflex of the number (in this case duah). Semantically, among the dual and trial forms, only kitah is restricted to ONE speaker and ONE addressee. All other dual and trial pronouns refer to either two or three addressees (maduah, mataluh); the speaker and his companion or companions, i.e, two or three people (kadiwah, kataluh); or two or three other people, i.e., [-speaker], [-addressee] (diwah, dataluh).

---

[16]Greenberg (1963:94) states, "No language has a trial number unless it has a dual. No language has a dual unless it has a plural."

[17]According to Blust (1977:117; fn 13), trial and plural pronouns in Uma Juman Kayan overlap in usage and the four-way number distinction may be changing to a three-way distinction.

[18]Laidig & Laidig (1990:93) point out that plurals overlap in usage with both duals and trials in Larike (cf. fn 17).

[19]According to Hockett (1958:234) the paucal (a few) contrasts with multiple (many) in Fijian.

[20]Cf. Laidig & Laidig (1990:99) for Larike.

Like the "pseudo-dual" in Bonggi, Kelabit dual and trial marking is restricted to pronominals. However, unlike Bonggi where the "pseudo-dual" only occurs with 1st person, in Kelabit dual and trial extend to 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person (cf. Table 5). Dual marking of 1st, 2nd, and 3rd person in Kelabit is illustrated in (8), (9), and (10). In (8) **kadiwah** is a first-person dual exclusive pronoun which refers to the speaker and his companion.

(8) **Kadiwah mei.**
1dl(excl) go
'The two of us are going.'

In (9) **maduah** is a second-person dual pronoun which refers to the addressee and his companion, or two addressees.

(9) **Maduah mei.**
2dl go
'The two of you are going.'

In (10) **diwah** is a third-person dual pronoun which refers to two people who are neither the speaker nor the addressee.

(10) **Diwah mei.**
3dl go
'The two of them are going.'

2.4 Status

As stated in section 2.2 the pronominal property person is defined with reference to the notion of participant role, i.e., [+speaker], [+addressee], or [-speaker -addressee]. Another pronominal property which is related to person is status. Status is defined with reference to the relationship between the interlocutors with one often being [+status] and the other [-status] (cf. Lyons 1968:280).

Some languages make a distinction in personal pronouns based on status, for example, Latin distinguishes two singular pronouns of address, tu and vos.[11]

Pronouns in Bahasa Malaysia vary not only in grammatical properties (e.g., person and number) but also in stylistic or sociolinguistic implications. "As such, one has to learn the sociolinguistic contexts which go with these pronouns before one can really use them" [appropriately and effectively] (Asmah 1983:92). BM distinguishes personal pronouns on the basis of status, especially the second person as shown in Table 6 where the terms in the column [+status] are used by a

---

[11]Although Brown & Gilman (1960) account for the selection of the 'familiar' form T (tu) versus the 'polite' form V (vos) in Latin and other European languages in terms of two basic oppositions power and solidarity, we follow Lyons (1968) in using the term status to refer to the relationship between the interlocutors.

superior in speaking to a subordinate while those in the column [-status] are used by a subordinate in speaking to a superior (cf. Table 2):[22]

Table 6
Bahasa Malaysia Nominative-case Pronouns[23]
From The Speaker's Perspective

	[+status]	[-status]
1sg	saya/aku	saya
2sg	awak/anda/kamu/engkau[24]	
3sg	beliau/dia	beliau/dia
1 incl	kita	kita
1 excl	kami	kami
2pl	kamu	
3pl	mereka	mereka

An interesting feature of Table 6 is that a [-status] member of the dyad may not even use a second-person pronoun when being respectful and speaking to a [+status] member of the dyad. However, the [+status] member of the dyad may use personal pronouns when addressing the [-status] member of the dyad but the reverse is not considered acceptable (cf. Baetens Beardsmore 1982:65).

A number of possible relationships are involved in the dyad. In some cases both members of the dyad are of equal status while in other cases they are not. When both members of the dyad are of equal status and the situation is [+formal] there is a tendency for [-status] forms to be used. On the other hand, when both members of the dyad are of equal status and the situation is [-formal] there is a tendency for [+status] forms to be used.

One dyad in which the members are of unequal status is that between a parent and child as illustrated in (11) where the child, being the [-status] member of the dyad, uses a kinship term *mak* 'mother' instead of a second-person pronoun. Age is the variable distinguishing [±status] in (11):[25]

(11) Mother: Aku pergi, tapi kau tak boleh pergi.
I go but you not can go
'I am going but you are not going.'

Child: Kalau mak pergi, saya pun pergi juga.
if mother go I also go too
'If you go, I will go, too.'

[22] [+status] and [-status] are comparable to the terms used by Nik Safiah in describing pronominal social stratification in BM, i.e., *tinggi* 'high' and *rendah* 'low' (Nik Safiah 1981:105).

[23] Table 6 does not include royal pronouns as discussed in Asmah (1987:83ff) and Abdul Aziz (1983:16). Cf. (Maxwell 1984:27) and Fatimah (1991) for a discussion of royal pronouns in Kadayan and Brunei Malay respectively.

[24] Engkau can be shortened to kau.

[25] Example (11) is taken from Nik Safiah (1981:106).

Another variable distinguishing [±status] is occupation as illustrated in (12) where the employer uses the second-person pronoun awak because he is [+status] and the situation is [+formal]. On the other hand, the employee being the [-status] member of the dyad uses the title *encik* 'mister' instead of a second-person pronoun:[16]

(12) Employer: Di mana awak tadi?.
where you earlier
'Where were you just now?'

Employee: Saya pergi ke Pejabat Pos.
I went to office post
'I went to the post office.'

Encik yang suruh saya hantar surat encik.
Mister who told me send letter mister
'You told me to send your letter.'

Distinctions in pronoun usage which are based on status are not only found in Standard Malay but also in other Malay dialects, e.g., North Moluccan Malay (Taylor 1983), and Brunei Malay (Fatimah 1991). Abrogating the sociolinguistic conventions underlying pronoun usage shows disrespect within the respective speech community.

2.5 Definiteness

Personal pronouns have a deictic function in that their meaning is determined with reference to the situation of utterance. Thus, in a conversation between two people the referents for *I* and *you* change every time one of the participants takes a turn speaking.

Another deictic function associated with pronouns is definiteness. A pronoun is definite whenever it can be uniquely identified by the speaker and addressee. Although none of the three languages examined have suppletive forms distinguishing definite and indefinite personal pronouns, Bonggi uses the clitic na 'DEF' to distinguish definiteness in third-person plural pronouns. That is, sigelama 'they' can be definite in which case it is marked by na as in (3) or indefinite in which case it is unmarked as in (13) (cf. (5)):

(13) Sigelama ig-bunu' sei.
they REC-fight only
'All they do is fight (with each other).'

The clitic na can occur in Bonggi with pronouns other than third-person plural. However, since the other pronouns are already definite na has a emphatic function as shown in (14) (cf. (15)):

---

[16]Cf. Nik Safiah (1981:101-18) for other variables besides age and occupation which contribute to [±status] in BM.

(14) Ou na piniit ngia.
I EMPH sent him
'I am the one who was sent by him.'

(15) Ou piniit ngia.
I sent him
'I was sent by him.'

3. SUMMARY

Table 7 provides a summary of the distinctive pronominal properties which occur in the three languages examined.

Table 7
Summary of Distinctive Pronominal Properties

	BM	BONGGI	KELABIT
Case	+	+	+
Person	+	+	+
Number	+	+	+
Status	+	–	–
Definiteness	–	–[11]	–

Table 7 indicates that acquisition of the property status is a formidable task for Bonggi and Kelabit speakers who aspire to use BM pronouns appropriately.

REFERENCES

Abdul Aziz bin Mohd. Sharif. 1983. Problem areas in the acquisition of the Malaysian national language and their effects on communication. Paper presented at the Asian Association on National Languages Seventh Conference, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Asmah Haji Omar. 1983. The Malay peoples of Malaysia and their languages. Kuala Lumpur: Devan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Asmah Haji Omar. 1987. Malay in its sociocultural context. Kuala Lumpur: Devan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo. 1982. Bilingualism: Basic principles. Clevedon: Tieto Ltd.

Blust, Robert A. 1977. Sketches of the morphology and phonology of Bornean languages 1: Uma Juman (Kayan). Papers in Borneo and Western Austronesian linguistics No. 2, 9-122. Pacific Linguistics A-33.

Blust, Robert A. n.d. Kelabit-English vocabulary. To appear in SMJ.

Boutin, Michael E. 1991. Reference and address systems in Sabah languages. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 1991.

Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. Style in language, ed. T.A. Sebeok, 253-76. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Carstairs, Andrew. 1987. Allomorphy in inflexion. London: Croom Helm.

---

[11] Bonggi na 'DEF' distinguishes definiteness only in third-person plural pronouns.

Conklin, Harold C. 1962. Lexicographical treatment of folk taxonomies. Problems in lexicography, eds. Fred W. Householder and Sol Saporta, 119-41. Bloomington: International Journal of American Linguistics.

Diffloth, G. 1979. Asilan languages and Southeast Asian prehistory. Federation Museums Journal 24:3-16.

Diver, William. 1987. The dual. Columbia University Working Papers in Linguistics 8:100-114.

Elkins, Richard E. 1973. Pronominalization in Western Bukidnon Manobo folktales. Parangal Kay Cecilio Lopez, ed. Andrew B. Gonzales, 112-24. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Fatimah Awg Chuchu. 1991. Bahasa Dalam and Malay speech etiquette in Brunei: a description. Paper presented at the Sixth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Honolulu, Hawaii, May 1991.

Furby, Christine E. 1972. The pronominal system of Garava. Oceanic Linguistics 11(1):1-31.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. Universals of language. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1988. The first person dual inclusive as an ambiguous category. Studies in Language 12(1):1-18.

Hockett, Charles F. 1958. A course in modern linguistics. New York: MacMillan.

Hopper, Paul J. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1984. The discourse basis for lexical categories in universal grammar. Language 60(4):703-52.

Hudson, A.B. 1978. Linguistic relations among Bornean peoples with special reference to Sarawak: An interim report. Sarawak linguistics and development problems, 1-44. Studies in Third World Societies.

Laidig, Wyn D. and Carol J. Landig. 1990. Larike pronouns: Duals and trials in a Central Moluccan language. Oceanic Linguistics 29(2):87-109.

Love, Ivan. 1974. An algebraic theory of English pronominal reference (Part II): plurals from singulars. Semiotica 10(1):43-73.

Lusted, Ruth, Claudia Whittle, and Lavrence A. Reid. 1964. The use of matrix technique in an analysis of Atta personal pronouns. Oceanic Linguistics 3(1):138-60.

Lyons, John. 1968. Introduction to theoretical linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Maxwell, Allen R. 1984. Kadayan personal names and naming. Naming systems, ed. Elisabeth Tooker, 25-39. Washington, D.C.: American Ethnological Society.

McKaughan, Howard P. 1959. Semantic components of pronoun systems: Maranao. Word 15(1):101-02.

McKay, Graham R. 1978. Pronominal person and number categories in Rembarrnga and Djeebbana. Oceanic Linguistics 17(1):27-37.

Mel'Čuk, Igor A. 1986. The dualizer and pluralizers in the Alutor verb. Language in global perspective, ed. Benjamin F. Elson, 421-38. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Mithun, Marianne. 1988. Lexical categories and the evolution of number marking. Theoretical morphology: Approaches in modern linguistics, eds. Michael Hammond and Michael Noonan. London: Academic Press.

Mithun, Marianne. 1989. The subtle significance of the locus of morphologization. International Journal of American Linguistics 55(3):265-82.

Nik Safiah Karim. 1981. Beberapa persoalan sosiolinguistik Bahasa Melayu. Kuala Lumpur: Devan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

Pence, Alan R. 1968. An analysis of Kunimaipa pronouns. Kivung 1(2):109-16. (Journal of the Linguistic Society of the University of Papua New Guinea.)

Plank, Frans. 1989. On Humbolt on the dual. Linguistic categorization, eds. Roberta Corrigan, Fred Eckman, and Michael Noonan, 293-333. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1963. Theoretical implications of matrix permutation in Fore (New Guinea). Linguistics 5(8):1-23.

Sapir, Edward. 1921. Language: An introduction to the study of speech. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Saville, Muriel R. and Rudolph C. Troike. 1971. A handbook of bilingual education. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.

Schutz, Albert J. 1985. The Fijian language. Honolulu: Univ. of Hawaii Press.

Sugamoto, Nobuko. 1989. Pronominality: A noun-pronoun continuum. Linguistic categorization, eds. Roberta Corrigan, Fred Eckman, and Michael Noonan, 267-91. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Taylor, Paul Michael. 1983. North Moluccan Malay: Notes on a "substandard" dialect of Indonesian. Studies in Malay dialects: Part II, ed. James T. Collins, 14-27. NUSA vol. 17.

Thomas, David. 1955. Three analyses of the Ilocano pronoun system. Word 2(2):204-08.

Topping, Donald M. 1973. Chamorro reference grammar. Honolulu: University Press of Hawaii.

Wallace, Judith M. 1965. Katu personal pronouns. Van-Hoa Nguyet-San 14(6):1023-30.

Watson, Richard L. 1976. Pacoh numerals. Linguistics 174:81-87. The Hague: Mouton.

Weaver, Dan and Marilou Weaver. 1964. Ranking of personal pronouns in Agusan Manobo. Oceanic Linguistics 3(1):161-70.